D. M. Pritchard 2004 (in press), *Phoenix* 58.

Kleisthenes, Participation, and the Dithyrambic Contests of Late Archaic and Classical Athens

Classical and postclassical sources agree that one of the main goals of the tribal and political reforms of the late sixth-century leader, Kleisthenes, was to 'mix up' the Athenians.[1] While accepting this general testimony, recent scholarship has shown much less agreement about whether the impetus for these reforms came from above or below. For example, Martin Ostwald and Greg Anderson maintain that Kleisthenes was the one who was deeply concerned about the factionalism of his fellow aristocrats and so came up with the idea of formally involving the *dēmos* in political decision-making as a check against the excesses of aristocratic competitiveness.[2] Josiah Ober is highly critical of such elitist explanations and argues – in my opinion on a sound evidentiary base (Hdt. 5.65.5-5.73.1; *Ath. Pol.* 20.1-21.2) – that '…*demokratia* was not a gift from a benevolent elite to a passive demos, but was the product of collective decision, action, and self-definition on the part of the demos itself.'[3] Christian Meier believes, like Ober, that the uprising of ordinary Athenians against those trying to establish a partisan oligarchy in 508/7 BCE was an unprecedented expression of non-elite solidarity and political aspirations.[4] He cautions, though, that this new popular sensibility was relatively weak and amorphous and that the democracy itself took a further fifty years to be fully elaborated. These different emphases notwithstanding, Ostwald, Ober and Meier – along with the late David Lewis – agree that the reforms of Kleisthenes were indispensable for facilitating

Earlier versions of this article were delivered, in 2004, at the University of Otago, the University of Canterbury, the University of Melbourne, the Australian Archaeological Institute at Athens, and the twenty-fifth conference of the Australian Society for Classical Studies, convened by La Trobe University (Bendigo); in 2002 at the conference 'Greek Drama III,' honouring the memory of Kevin Lee and convened by the University of Sydney; and, in 2000, at the conference 'Olympia and the Olympics: Festival and Identity in the Ancient World,' jointly convened by Macquarie University and the University of Sydney as part of the lead-up to the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. I thank the abovementioned universities for their invitations to speak and am grateful for the helpful comments of those who heard this piece. The article has benefited too from the useful suggestions made on versions of it by Ben Brown, Chris Collard, John Davidson, Nick Fisher, Ian Plant, Hayden Pelliccia, Patricia Rovik, Peter Wilson and the several readers of this journal. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations of the Greek are my own.

and undergirding the independent involvement of non-elite Athenians in political decision-making.[5] In particular, the 'mixing up' of citizens circumvented two continuing obstacles to the political participation of lower class citizens: their overwhelming self-identity not as Athenians but as members of this or that region of Attike and their traditionally dependent relationship with local upper class leaders.[6]

These and other scholars have assumed that the chief institutions for the 'mixing up' of Athenians, socially and regionally, were the city-based hoplite army and the Council of Five Hundred – both of which were created as part of the Kleisthenic reforms.[7] Certainly, as the hoplite army of classical Athens typically included the topmost thirty percent or so of citizens, its ranks 'mixed up' elite *and* non-elite citizens.[8] Similarly, since about thirty percent of Athenians, at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, and double this figure, in the late fourth century, participated in the Council of Five Hundred, this institution also brought a significant number of non-elite citizens in contact with elite compatriots.[9] Moreover, organized as they were along tribal lines, participation in these two institutions allowed a *phyletēs* to work with, and get to know, fellow tribesmen from each of the three geographical districts into which Kleisthenes had divided Attike. Therefore, being part of the hoplite army and the Council of Five Hundred would have enabled poor citizens of late archaic and classical Athens to get to know others from different parts of the country and to interact with each other, not as elite leaders and non-elite followers, but as fellow tribesmen and citizens. Such new connections ensured poor Athenians would increasingly focus on, and work towards, civic ventures.

In the last decade it has been repeatedly argued that the tribally organized competitions to sing and dance a dithyramb also served as a *critical institution* for creating solidarity between members of each of the tribes and breaking down the regionalism and traditional class dynamics that could have undermined the democracy.[10] Bernhard Zimmermann for one holds that the dithyrambic

choruses were an extremely significant element of the Kleisthenic reforms: the participation of elite and non-elite Athenians in them strengthened solidarity between tribesmen from different regions of Attike and encouraged them to see the city of Athens as their 'politische, kulturelle and religiöse Heimat.'[11] Nick Fisher suggests that each year thousands of Athenians, reaching 'at least among the hoplite class and perhaps further', participated in the dithyrambic and other contests for tribal teams, and that such broad based involvement 'helped to increase tribal solidarity and to break down class suspicions and hostility.'[12] Peter Wilson argues in his *The Athenian Institution of the* Khoregia*: The Chorus, the City and the Stage* that, despite socio-economic impediments to participation, 'a good number of Athenian boys' from elite and non-elite families did join tribal choruses.[13] He also believes – along with Mark Golden – that 'Training of this sort for an extended period with fellow-boys from one's *phyle* drawn from geographically diverse regions of Attike will have helped to form the early stages of a sense of phyletic solidarity that would be important to later socio-political (including military) life.'[14] Like Denis Roussel, what these scholars are suggesting in effect is that participation in dithyrambic choruses constitutes a 'clear analogy' to involvement in the tribally arranged hoplite army and Council of Five Hundred.[15] In view of this new interpretation and the fact that these choruses were introduced *around the same time* as the creation of the Council of Five Hundred and the city-based hoplite army, we can well understand why Peter Wilson argues, in his chapter for *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World,* that '…the *choral* reorganisation of the Great Dionysia – often regarded as little more than a matter of faintly antiquarian literary history – should be seen as an absolutely integral part of…[the Kleisthenic] plan.'[16]

This article seeks to test this now predominant interpretation of the dithyrambic competitions as one of the chief means by which tribal solidarity was created and citizens of different regions and social classes got to mingle and connect with each other.[17] In particular it will scrutinize the underlying premise

of this new orthodoxy, namely that significant numbers of non-elite Athenian boys and men sang and danced dithyrambs. Admittedly, the dithyrambic contests were only one element of the reforms of Kleisthenes and are only a small part of my own research on participation in the tribes of classical Athens.[18] Nonetheless, the results of this scrutiny will allow us to reconstruct the purposes of the new dithyrambic competitions and to develop a more complex and differentiated understanding of the functions of the different elements of the Kleisthenic reforms.

Before investigating participation in the dithyrambic competitions, the terminology of social class used in this article and the model of classical Athenian society informing the analysis should be clarified.[19] Throughout this article terms, such as 'elite' and 'non-elite' and 'the upper class' and 'the lower class', are used as synonyms for 'the wealthy' and 'the poor'. Although classical Athenians are known to have divided up the citizen-body, conceptually and practically, on the basis of military roles, the Solonian *telē*, occupation or place of residence, the distinction that was used most often and 'cut at the social joints' best was between *hoi plousioi* (the wealthy) and *hoi penetes* (the poor).[20] According to the city's extant comedy and oratory, the rich were marked out primarily by their lives of *skholē* (leisure) and hence lack of the necessity to work, distinctive clothing and footwear, particular but not always highly esteemed attitudes and actions, and exclusive pastimes, such as athletics, hunting, horsemanship, pederastic homosexuality and mannered drinking parties.[21] They were also expected to undertake expensive public services, paid the *eisphora* or extraordinary war tax, and furnished the city's political and military leaders.[22] Their lifestyle and significant contributions to public life made them conspicuous amongst the city's residents. They most probably numbered close to, but less than, five percent of the citizen-body.[23] While it contrasts markedly with how contemporary North Americans and Australians carefully divide up society into gradations of upper, middle and lower classes,

the Athenians of the fifth and fourth centuries classed the rest of the citizen-body – from the truly destitute to those sitting just below the elite – as 'the poor'. Classical sources suggest that what the varied members of this class had in common was a lack of leisure and hence a need to work and a way of life that was frugal and moderate.[24] This ancient and fundamental dichotomy between rich and poor serves as the main social classification in this article's scrutiny of participation in the dithyrambic competitions of late archaic and classical Athens.

Socio-Economic Barriers to Non-Elite Participation

From 508/7 BCE each of the ten newly created tribes entered a team of fifty boys and another of fifty men into the competition to sing and dance a dithyramb at the annual festival of the Great Dionysia.[25] And certainly by 420/19 tribes formed into pairs each year to submit similarly sized choruses of boys and men in the dithyrambic contest at Apollo's festival of the Thargelia (Antiphon 6.11).[26] The main responsibility for training a dithyrambic chorus as well as for recruiting its singers and paying its production expenses fell to an elite citizen who had been invited or, if necessary, conscripted by his *symphyletai* to be a *khorēgos* or so-called chorus leader/sponsor.[27]

The extent to which non-elite as well as elite citizens were *khoreutai* (chorus members) can be determined by considering the demands and costs of being a member of a dithyrambic chorus, the social position of those capable of meeting these, the types of Athenians a chorus sponsor would have preferred to have in his team, and, lastly, any explicit ancient evidence about the background of dithyrambic choristers.

These tribally arranged choruses apparently trained very hard. Xenophon writes repeatedly that the preparations for such competitions involved *polloi ponoi* or many painful labours bringing honour (*Eq. mag.* 1.26; *Hiero* 9.11); and Demosthenes explains that an *adidaktos* (untrained) chorus would be

uncompetitive and a great disgrace to its tribe (21.17). The first clues about the actual time demands of being a dithyrambic singer and dancer come from the timetable for appointing chorus sponsors. One of the first duties of the eponymous archon, when he entered office in the month of Hekatombaion (June/July), was to accept the names of the *khorēgoi* the tribes had selected for their 'circular choruses' at the Great Dionysia and Thargelia (*Ath. Pol.* 56.3).[28] Admittedly, training could not start straight way, as first the chief magistrate had to allow the legal challenges of those disputing their conscription as chorus masters to take place and the Assembly needed to meet in order that the finalized group of chorus sponsors could select their poet and probably also piper (Dem. 21.13-14; Antiphon 6.11). Nevertheless, the formal requirement that the members of the adult choruses seek exemption from military service suggests that these preliminaries took no more than a month or so (Dem. 21.15, 39.16-18); for a longer delay of, say, two months would have made such an exemption largely unnecessary, since the regular season for overseas military campaigns came to an end in mid-September.[29] As the festivals of the Great Dionysia and Thargelia took place in Elaphebolion (February/March) and Thargelion (April/May) respectively, training for dithyrambic choruses would appear to have extended over several months.[30] Such team training sessions, like the other corporate activities of the tribes, would have taken place in the *astu* (urban centre).[31]

That those being trained received a *misthos* or wage is what Pseudo-Xenophon implies when he complains about the lack of culture and avarice of the Athenian *dēmos* (1.13): 'Those practising athletics and music there the people have destroyed, since they do not believe this is a good thing and know themselves to be unable to practise these things.'[32] However, the *dēmos*, whom he elsewhere characterizes as sub-hoplite (1.2), still appreciate how the wealthy are the ones sponsoring choruses and torch racing teams and performing trierarchies, whereas they only have to be the choristers, torch racers and sailors

(1.3). As a result, Pseudo-Xenophon writes, 'The people think it right at least to take money (*argurion*) for singing, running, dancing and sailing the ships in order that they themselves shall become prosperous and the wealthy poorer.' It is true, this writer does make, from time to time, accurate comments on Athenian realities. Frequently, however, his political partisanship and class prejudice cause him to exaggerate and even misrepresent aspects of Athenian democracy and society.[33] This passage is an example of his typically falsifying modus operandi. Quite apart from the logical contradiction between what Pseudo-Xenophon writes here and at 2.10 where he has the *dēmos* building wrestling schools for themselves, the Athenian people manifestly did think athletics to be a good thing. From the 430s onwards they gave *sitēsis* (free meals) and probably also *proedria* (front row seats in the theatre) *for life* to those who had won at the Olympic, Pythian, Nemean or Isthmian Games (*IG* I^3 131; Pl. *Ap.* 36d-e; Dem. 20.141).[34] Moreover, while the poets of Old Comedy were free to ridicule any prominent citizen they liked and even the Athenian people, their overwhelmingly non-elite audiences restrained them from attacking famous athletes.[35] Sportsmen apparently were beyond comic criticism. What Pseudo-Xenophon claims about torch racers is also contradicted by more reliable sources: Xenophon and Aristotle have those training to run a torch race for their tribe receiving not *misthos* but *trophē* (maintenance – *Vect.* 4.51-52; *Ath. Pol.* 42.3), and Aristophanes presents running a torch race as one of a number of exclusively upper class activities (*Vesp.* 1122-1264, especially 1202-1205).[36] Therefore, in view of the unreliability of Pseudo-Xenophon as historical evidence, it seems preferable to accept the testimony of a late fifth-century forensic oration that the chorus sponsor, instead of wages, provided for the daily needs of *khoreutai* by organizing for the necessary purchases himself and paying for them out of his own pocket (Antiphon 6.13).[37]

A good way to try and clarify the regularity and length of choral training sessions as well as the ability of different classes of Athenians to attend them is

to think about the regular schooling of an Athenian boy and how being a dithyrambic chorister would have dovetailed with it.[38] Throughout the classical period, the so-called 'old education' of boys consisted of the disciplines of *grammata* (letters), *mousikē* (music) and *gymnastikē* or athletics (Pl. *Prt.* 312b).[39] As classes in each of these were taken concurrently, groups of students travelled between *didaskaleia* (school rooms) throughout the day (e.g. Ar. *Nub.* 963-964), presumably spending no more than a few hours at the establishment of each teacher.[40] Such a pattern of school attendance is encapsulated in the verb *phoitaō*, which the classical Athenians used to describe a student going to school; its basic meaning is to go back and forth with great regularity.[41] Therefore, in order for an Athenian boy to attend his normal classes with his *grammatistēs* (letter teacher), *kitharistēs* (kithara teacher) and *paidotribēs* (athletics teacher), during the many months when he was training to be a dithyrambic chorister, each practice session with his *symphyletai* would have had to have lasted no more than a few hours. That training for the boys' dithyramb was indeed scheduled in this way is strongly suggested by its apparent assimilation with the regular school curriculum in the minds of classical Athenians: young dithyrambic choristers were said to rehearse in a *didaskaleion* set up in the house of the chorus sponsor (Antiphon 6.11); tellingly, the verb used to describe their attendance there was *phoitaō* (Dem. 39.23-24; Aeschin. 1.10; cf. *IG* II^2 1250.8); and such choral lessons could be presented as another regular discipline of the traditional education of a young Athenian.[42]

Classical Athenian writers appreciate that the number of disciplines of the 'old education' that could be undertaken by an individual boy and the length of his schooling were dependent on the monetary resources of his family. This inequality of opportunity is succinctly captured by Protagoras who says of the three strands of Athenian education that they are taken by those '…who are most able; and the most able are the wealthiest (*hoi plousiōtatoi*). Their sons

begin school at the earliest stage, and are freed from it at the latest' (Pl. *Prt.* 326c).[43] The socio-economic circumstances of a family determined, not only whether they could pay the not always insignificant fees of the letter teacher, lyre teacher and athletics teacher (cf. Ath. 584c), but also whether they could give their sons the required leisure to pursue disciplines that were taught concurrently. Classical Greek writers and speakers make clear that most poor citizens were unable to afford a sufficient or even any household slaves and so needed their children and wives to help out with the daily operation of family farming or business concerns (Arist. *Pol.* 1323a5-7; Hdt. 6.137; Dem. 57.41-44). They were well aware how such a reliance on child labour markedly restricted the educational opportunities of male children.[44] In *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* I analyse the evidence which shows that poor Athenian families, as a result of socio-economic *and* cultural impediments, passed over *mousikē* and *gymnastikē* and sent their sons only to lessons in *grammata*, which they judged the most useful for business and political participation and the most important for instructing their sons in military and personal morality.[45]

In view of such choices by poor Athenian parents about the formal education of their sons, the participation of non-elite youngsters in the dithyrambic training sessions of their tribes seems far from certain. If a poor family could not afford to send their sons to music and athletics classes, it is unlikely that they would have sent them to the singing and dancing lessons of the tribe. Nor is it likely that they would have their boys give up the practical and moral lessons of the *grammatistēs* in favour of choral training. We might also wonder whether indigent Athenian families could really afford to do without the labour of their sons so that they could regularly go off, for months on end, to the townhouse of the *khorēgos*, or, if they lived far from the city, whether they had the spare cash so that their boys might find overnight accommodation after the city-based training sessions were over. Still more certain is that if a poor Athenian father was not able to let his sons go to choral

training, he would not have had the leisure and wherewithal himself to be part of a men's dithyramb for his tribe.

Athenian chorus sponsors had good reasons to avoid recruiting lower class Athenians for their dithyrambic teams. Even if a *khorēgos* did not win and so was under no pressure to commission an expensive victory monument or to dine his winning team sumptuously (Ar. *Nub.* 338-339), he would still have spent in the order of a few thousand drachmas on the training, provisioning and costuming of his choristers.[46] Such heavy expenses were borne, not out of any disinterested philanthropy on his part, but because of his *philonikia* and *philotimia* (Xen. *Mem.* 3.4.3; Dem. 21.66, 69) – a fondness for victory and honour easy to understand in light of the rewards and advantages accompanying success. To begin with, the victorious *khorēgos* was esteemed highly by his fellow tribesmen.[47] For example, in 403/2 BCE the tribe of Pandionis passed a decree praising the *andragathia* of an otherwise unknown Nikias and organizing for him to be crowned (*IG* II^2 1138.6-7) and an honorary decree to be set up in the tribe's sanctuary on the Akropolis (7-9; cf. 1139), because he had been a zealous chorus sponsor for two tribal teams in the same year and had won at the Dionysia *and* the Thargelia (1-6). In later years, tribes also gave their victorious chorus sponsors honours of a less purely symbolic character, such as gold crowns worth hundreds of drachmas (1157.7-9; 1158.5-7) and even ajtevleian tw`n lh/tourgiw`n tw`n ejgkuklivwn dia; duvo e[th ('an exemption from the liturgies of the circular choruses for two years' – 1147.9-11). The prestige of the victorious chorus sponsor also spread across the city where, as the career of the much better known late fifth-century leader Nikias illustrates (Plut. *Nic.* 3.1-3), it could be transformed into political influence and support amongst the citizen masses.[48]

Liberal expenditure as a *khorēgos*, especially if resulting in victory, also served as a kind of legal insurance. In court, upper class speakers habitually tried to improve their chances by cataloguing their past choral sponsorships and

other liturgies, like the trierarchy, in an attempt to instil a sense of *kharis* (gratitude) in the jurors (e.g. Lysias 3.46, 12.38, 21.1-6, 30.1).[49] And some litigants even admitted that the main reason for their performance of liturgies in the first place had been to try and guarantee the *kharis* of any prospective jury (e.g. 18.23, 20.31, 25.12-13).

With so much riding on success, *khorēgoi* rather unsurprisingly jostled with each other to secure the most accomplished dithyrambic poet (Ar. *Pax* 1403-404; Xen. *Mem.* 3.4.4) and *aulos* player (Dem. 21.13-14).[50] We also know that they were very careful to recruit 'the best' singers and dancers (Antiphon 6.11; Xen. *Mem.* 3.4.4), and, with parents who might be reluctant for their sons to be choristers, they even had the means to compel them to hand over their sons for dithyrambic training (Antiphon 6.11). Those best qualified to be boy or adult *khoreutai* were members of the Athenian elite. They had the months of free time to attend the choral training sessions. Moreover, while rich Athenians had country houses and agricultural plots (e.g. Dem. 21.158; Th. 2.65.3; cf. Isoc. 7.52), especially in their ancestral demes, they also had first or second residences in or around the *astu* or in the Piraeus (e.g. Aeschin. 1.97; Is. 11.40-43), allowing their sons to remain within the city during their student years (e.g. Lys. 20.11-12; Men. *Dys.* 40-42, 766-769, 774-775).[51] Therefore, elite choristers would always have had a place to stay overnight, if necessary, after the city-based training sessions were over.[52] Finally, as lessons in *mousikē* were another preserve of wealthy citizens, they alone had 'the necessary musical background' to attempt dithyrambs, which were no barnyard sing-a-longs, but poems of highly complex language and phraseology (Ar. *Pax* 828-831; *Av.* 1372-409; *Nub.* 333-338), lofty subject matter and, from the second half of the fifth century, rapid formal changes.[53] Thus, the *khorēgoi* of classical Athens had good reasons to try and stick with fellow members of the elite when selecting chorus members.

Demographic Modelling and Literary Evidence

While it runs against the new orthodoxy which assumes substantial numbers of non-elite Athenians sung and danced dithyrambs, demographic considerations suggest that *khorēgoi* could have drawn most or, in most instances, all of their choristers from the ranks of the city's upper class, and what ancient evidence there is confirms that they did in fact do so. The following calculations are based on the work of Mogens Hansen whose population figures for Periklean and late fourth-century Athens as well as choice of the most appropriate Coale–Demeny model life table for approximating ancient Greek conditions remain – as Mark Golden and others have shown – valid and unchallenged.[54]

Again, it is best to begin with participation in the dithyrambic contests for the so-called *paides* or boys (e.g. Antiphon 6.11, 13; Dem. 21.10; *IG* II^2 1138); for, as the 'pool of available *khoreutai*, considered simply in terms of age, was rather narrower for boys' *khoroi* than for men's,' any demographic pressures on *khorēgoi* to use non-elite Athenians would have been most acute with child choristers.[55] From the diverse definitions of *pais* in classical Greek literature we can safely infer that those 'boys' recruited for dithyrambic competition were aged between 10 and 17 years old.[56] In contrast to service on the Council of Five Hundred (*Ath. Pol.* 62.3), there was no limit on the number of times an Athenian could be a dithyrambic chorister (Dem. 21.60). Therefore, since it was legally possible for an Athenian boy to be part of his tribe's fifty strong chorus at the Great Dionysia and to dance too at the Thargelia *in the same year*, the minimum number of 10 to 17 year olds needed to run these dithyrambic contests was 500 per annum.

Working with this minimum of 500, we need now to approximate what percentage of 10 to 17 year old Athenian boys were needed to fill it. Hansen has established that there were around 30,000 adult citizens *living in Attike* in the late fourth century.[57] Since males aged 18 to 80+ years on the relevant model

life table are only 57.47% of all males, his figure of 30,000 predicts 52,200 citizen boys and adults.[58] In the same model life table, males aged between 10 and 17 years inclusive are 16.97% of the total population. Therefore, of these 52,200 Athenians some 8,858 are 10 to 17 years old, and of these so-called *paides* only 5.65% were needed to fill the 500 dithyrambic choristers required each year. Hansen calculates that around 60,000 adult Athenian males *lived in Attike* at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War.[59] Using the same calculations as above, this figure suggests 104,400 for all Athenian males, of which 17,717 were 10 to 17 years old. Thus, in Periklean Athens only 2.82% of all available *paides* were needed for the proper functioning of the boys' dithyrambic competitions at the Dionysia and Thargelia. As the elite of classical Athens numbered close to, but less than, 5% of the population (see above), these percentages suggest that late fourth-century *khorēgoi* could have drawn the vast majority of their boy choristers from the city's elite, while the chorus sponsors of the Periklean age could easily have filled their choruses with elite *paides* alone.

Admittedly, these calculations are based on the absolute minimum number of boys needed to run the dithyrambic contests of the Great Dionysia and the Thargelia. Nevertheless, the *actual number* of boys serving as choristers each year was most probably fairly close to this minimum. If cost is anything to go by (Lysias 21.1-5), choral training for the Thargelia was much shorter than that for the Great Dionysia. And the capacity of one late fifth-century gentleman to provide the facilities for, and to supervise, the training of a dithyrambic chorus at the Dionysia and another at the Thargelia, in the same year, suggests that training for the dithyrambic contest at the Thargelia took place in the two months between these festivals (*IG* II^2 1138; cf. Antiphon 6.11). For the Thargelia we should also bear in mind that each tribe was paired with another in its dithyrambic contests and so needed only to recruit 25 boys. It is also important that being a member of a dithyrambic chorus did not prevent a boy

from competing in the most esteemed contests for his age group: local and international games. As we have seen, dithyrambic training dovetailed with the regular classes of an Athenian student, including those of the athletics teacher. Since his lessons provided technical instruction in the standard events of ancient Greek games and doubled as an opportunity to practise these sports, training to sing and dance a dithyramb did not come at the expense of being a competitive athlete.[60] Therefore, in view of the less time consuming nature of choral training for the Thargelia and the ability of a young man to be a chorister *and* an athlete at the same time, it seems plausible to assume that half of the tribal team at the Great Dionysia could have been encouraged to stay on for the next dithyrambic competition. That there were indeed Athenian boys who trained for successive dithyrambic contests year-in year-out is confirmed by the assumption made in a fourth-century legal speech that elite individuals go to their respective tribe for regular choral classes, not for this or that festival, but habitually (Dem. 39.24, 29).[61]

However, while the actual number of boy choristers needed each year was most probably quite close to the theoretical minimum, we must take into account that an elite boy might have missed a year or two of choral participation, because, for example, he was having problems singing while his voice was breaking or had simply been too troublesome the year before to be taken up again immediately by a tribal *khorēgos*. We should acknowledge too that a small percentage of boys may have been too uncoordinated and unmusical to be competent dithyrambic choristers. Unfortunately, the state of the evidence provides us with no way of calculating how many boys above 500 were actually needed to compensate for such eventualities. Erring on the side of caution, a good guess might be 40% above this minimum number, which would translate into 700 boy choristers. On the population figures worked out above, for the late fourth century, only 7.90% of *paides* would have been needed to fill this revised figure and, in the Periklean age, this drops to only 3.95% of boys. Since the elite

of classical Athens was just under 5% of adult citizens, calculations based even on this cautious figure of 700 suggest that chorus sponsors, in the late fourth century, could still have secured a majority of their boy choristers from the families of the city's elite, while later fifth-century *khorēgoi* could have made up the required numbers with elite boys alone.

Critically, since the total number of men available to be choristers was always a few times greater than that for the boys' contests, even these cautiously revised minimum percentages indicate that the ranks of the Athenian elite, in the fifth *and* fourth centuries, could have comfortably furnished the numbers required to run the men's dithyrambic competitions.

That the *khorēgoi* of classical Athens actually did this is what is suggested by the ancient sources assimilating choral participation with exclusively upper class pursuits or attributes (e.g. Ath. 1.20e-f; Eur. *El.* 948-951). This association is clearest in the much discussed *parabasis* of *Frogs* where Aristophanes draws an analogy between the city's coinage and its leaders to make the comically scurrilous suggestion that the Athenians have abandoned their traditional reliance on elite politicians but must now reverse their ways (718-737).[62] In particular, the chorus complain (726-733; cf. *Eq.* 180-183):

> tw`n politw`n q j ou}~ me;n i[smen eujgenei`~ kai; swvfrona~
> a[ndra~ o[nta~ kai; dikaivou~ kai; kalouv~ te kajgaqou;~
> kai; trafevnta~ ejn palaivstrai~ kai; coroi`~ kai; mousikh/`,
> prouselou`men, toi`~ de; calkoi`~ kai; xevnoi~ kai; purrivai~
> kai; ponhroi`~ kajk ponhrw`n eij~ a{panta crwvmeqa
> uJstavtoi~ ajfigmevnoisin, oi|sin hJ povli~ pro; tou`
> oujde; farmakoi`sin eijkh/` rJa/divw~ ejcrhvsat j a[n.
>
> Of the citizens those we know to be well born, moderate and just gentlemen who have been raised in wrestling schools, choruses and music we maltreat. We employ instead the copper coins that are foreigners, red headed (Thracian slaves), wicked men sprung from

> men wicked in everything, whom the city formerly would not even have willingly used as scapegoats.

Choral participation here is wedged between the exclusively elite disciplines of *gymnastikē* and *mousikē* and all three are pursued by the 'well born gentlemen' of late fifth-century Athens.

The Purposes of the Dithyrambic Contests in the Kleisthenic Reforms

Ancient literary evidence and demography confirms that the demands and opportunity cost of dithyrambic participation impeded non-elite Athenian boys and men from joining a chorus of their tribe. They suggest too that chorus sponsors, driven as they were by their love of victory and honour, recruited a majority or, in most instances, all of their choristers from those best able to sing and dance a dithyramb: the upper class. Participation, then, in the dithyrambic contests was a predominantly or, more often than not, an exclusively elite pursuit. Therefore, in contrast to the Council of Five Hundred and the tribally organized military corps, which did 'mix up' significant numbers of Athenians, reaching down to and including the non-elite hoplites,[63] the dithyrambic competitions were not a significant mechanism for bringing individual wealthy and poor citizens together, nor were they one of the chief means by which ties of solidarity between fellow tribesmen and connections between citizens living in different parts of the country were created. Dithyrambic participation in late archaic and classical Athens was *not* a 'clear analogy' to service as a *bouleutēs* or *hoplitēs*.[64]

While we may no longer say that these choral competitions were introduced by Kleisthenes as part of his effort to 'mix up' as many Athenians as possible, alternate and – I would argue – adequate explanation for their introduction can be found in the other significant ways they undergirded his tribal and political reforms. Firstly, these new musical competitions would have

helped to cohere the Athenian elite and to placate any elite opposition to the Kleisthenic programme. As is often noted, a significant community problem of sixth-century Athens was the excessive rivalry between individual aristocrats and their supporters, which had already led to the Peisistratid tyranny (*Ath. Pol.* 15.2-3; Hdt. 1.61-62) and, in 508/7, was quickly leading to the establishment of a narrowly based oligarchy (*Ath. Pol.* 20.3; Hdt. 6.72.2). Dithyrambic participation helped moderate this intra-elite *stasis* by fostering bonds between upper class boys and men cutting across factions and regions and by schooling them in how to work together for tribal and civic, as opposed to partisan, ends. Moreover, since Greek aristocrats had long used choral training to educate their youngsters and prized *agōnes* as a means to prove *aretē* and to build up symbolic capital, wealthy Athenians no doubt welcomed these new competitions.[65] This expansion of agonistic opportunities for the city's elite may even have been a deliberate attempt by Kleisthenes to secure their support for a reform package placing marked restrictions on their political power as a class. Secondly, the goings-on at festivals were used by the ancient Greeks to articulate and legitimate civic ideology and social structure.[66] Thus, the introduction of new tribally organized contests into the Great Dionysia would have been an effective way to broadcast to, and solemnize for, all Athenians the new tribal organization of the city. Finally, while I take issue with some of his views, Peter Wilson establishes beautifully, in his chapter for *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*, that the cities of archaic and classical Greece knowingly and deliberately performed dithyrambs in order to harness the divine power of Dionysos to ward off *stasis* and to bring about civic cohesion and solidarity. Late sixth-century Athens did indeed stand in need of such magico-religious assistance. That these religious advantages would have been appreciated by Kleisthenes is suggested by the piety and sophistication he displayed when he had the Delphic oracle choose the ten 'national' demi-gods to be the figureheads of the city's new tribes (*Ath. Pol.* 21.6).[67]

In conclusion, the new tribally organized dithyrambic contests, hoplite army and Council of Five Hundred did 'mix up' citizens, but brought together different social classes of the citizen-body. Dithyrambic choruses did not duplicate the thorough mixing of elite and non-elite Athenians achieved by the other two institutions, but combined elite boys and men from different regions of Attike and traditional political factions, and encouraged them to accept the new political arrangements of Kleisthenes and to work cooperatively within them. As part of a significant festival of Dionysos, these choral competitions helped to legitimise the new tribal organization and ensure divine protection from future civil strife. Importantly, they were not the only element of the Kleisthenic reforms with such particular purposes. The military changes of the late sixth century ensured the Athenians had, for the first time, a city-based and formidable army, which they needed to meet the very real external threats to their new constitution (Hdt. 5.74-78).[68] And the Council of Five Hundred gave the *dēmos* the permanent institutional presence they required if they were to exercise the political power Kleisthenes had promised them.[69] To make these three institutions analogous, then, risks obscuring such differences of purpose and effaces the different ways they 'mixed up' the citizens of late archaic and classical Athens.

Dr David Pritchard
Macquarie University Research Fellow
Department of Ancient History
Division of Humanities
Macquarie University
NSW 2109
AUSTRALIA

E-mail: david.pritchard@hmn.mq.edu.au

Bibliography

Anderson, G. 2003. *The Athenian Experiment: Building an Imagined Political Community in Ancient Attica, 508-490 B.C.* Ann Arbor.

Beck, F.A.G. 1964. *Greek Education 450-350 BC.* London.

--- 1975. *Album of Greek Education: The Greeks at School and at Play*. Sydney.

--- 1978. 'The Schooling of Girls in Ancient Greece,' *Classicum* 9: 1-8.

Bugh, G.R. 1988. *The Horsemen of Athens*. Princeton.

Bruit Zaidman L.B. and P. Schmitt Pantel 1992. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*. Translated by P. Cartledge. Cambridge.

Cartledge, P. 2001. *Spartan Reflections*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Ceccarelli, P. 1993. 'Sans thalassocratie, pas de démocratie?: Le rapport entre thalassocratie et démocratie à Athènes dans la discussion du V et IV siècle av. J.-C.,' *Historia* 42: 444-470.

Coale, A.J. and P. Demeny 1966. *Regional Model Life Tables and Stable Populations*. Princeton.

Cole, S.G. 1981. 'Could Greek Women Read and Write,' in H.P. Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*. New York. 219-245.

Crowther, N.B. 1988. 'The Age-Category of Boys at Olympia,' *Phoenix* 42: 304-308.

Csapo, E. and W.J. Slater 1995. *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor.

Davies, J.K. 1967. 'Demosthenes on Liturgies: A Note,' *JHS* 87: 33-40.

--- 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*. New York.

Dickie, M. 1984. 'Phaeacian Athletics,' in F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, Fourth Volume, 1983*. 237-276.

Dover, K.J. 1974. *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford.

Fisher, N. 1998. 'Gymnasia and the Democratic Values of Leisure,' in P. Cartledge, P. Millett and S. von Reden (eds.), *Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*. Cambridge. 84-104.

Flensted-Jensen, P., T.H. Nielsen and L. Rubinstein (eds.) 2000. *Polis and Politics: Studies in Ancient Greek History: Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on His Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*. Aarhus.

Frost, F.J. 1984. 'The Athenian Military before Cleisthenes,' *Historia* 33: 283-294.

Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece: From Homer to the Fifth Century*. Translated by A.T. Cole. Baltimore.

Golden, M. 1987. Review of Hansen 1986, *Phoenix* 41: 445-446.

--- 1990. *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens*. Baltimore and London.

--- 1998. *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.

--- 2000 'A Decade of Demography. Recent Trends in the Study of Greek and Roman Populations,' in Flensted-Jensen *et alii* 2000: 23-40.

Goldhill, S. 1990. 'The Great Dionysia and Civic Ideology,' in J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?: Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton. 97-129.

Griffin, J. 1998. 'The Social Function of Attic Tragedy,' *CQ* 48: 39-61.

Hansen, M.H. 1981. 'The Number of Athenian Hoplites in 431 BC,' *SymbOslo* 56: 19-32.

--- 1986. *Demography and Democracy: The Number of Athenian Citizens in the Fourth Century B.C.* Herning.

--- 1988a. *Three Studies in Athenian Demography*. Copenhagen.

--- 1988b. 'The Average Age of Athenian *Bouleutai* and the Proportion of *Bouleutai* Who Served Twice,' *LCM* 13: 67-69.

--- 1991. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles and Ideology*. Cambridge (Massachusetts) and Oxford.

Hanson, V.D. 2001. 'Democratic Warfare, Ancient and Modern,' in D.R. McCann and B.S. Strauss (eds.), *War and Democracy: A Comparative Study of the Korean War and the Peloponnesian War*. Armonk and London. 3-33.

Harding, P. 1981. 'In Search of a Polypragmatist,' in G.S. Shrimpton and D.J. McCargar (eds.), *Classical Contributions: Studies in Honour of M.F. McGregor*. New York. 41-50.

Harris, W.V 1989. *Ancient Literacy.* Cambridge (Massachusetts) and London.

Hornblower, S. 2000. '*The Old Oligarch* (Pseudo-Xenophon's *Athenaion Politeia*) and Thucydides: A Fourth-Century Date for the *Old Oligarch*?,' in Flensted-Jensen *et alii* 2000: 363-384.

Ingalls, W.B. 2000. 'Ritual Performance as Training for Daughters in Archaic Greece,' *Phoenix* 54: 1-20.

Jones, N.F. 1987. *Public Organization in Ancient Greece: A Documentary Study*. Philadelphia.

--- 1995. 'The Athenian Phylai as Associations: Dispositions, Function, and Purpose,' *Hesperia* 64: 503-542.

--- 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*. New York and London.

Kowalzig, B. 2004. ‘Changing Choral Worlds: Song-Dance and Society in Athens and Beyond,’ in P. Murray and P. Wilson (eds.), *Music and the Muses: The Culture of ‘Mousikē’ in the Classical Athenian City*. Oxford. 39-65.

Kyle, D.G. 1987. *Athletics in Ancient Athens*. Leiden.

Lewis. D.M. 1963. ‘Cleisthenes and Attica,’ *Historia* 12: 22-40.

Lewis, S. 2002. *The Athenian Woman: An Iconographic Handbook*. London and New York.

MacDowell, D.M. 1990. *Demosthenes: Against Meidias (Oration 21)*. Oxford.

Markle, M.M. 1985. ‘Jury Pay and Assembly Pay,’ in P. Cartledge and D. Harvey (eds.), *Crux: Essays Presented to G.E.M. de Ste Croix on His Seventy Fifth Birthday*. Exeter. 265-297.

Marrou, H. 1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by G. Lamb. London.

Meier, C. 1990. *The Greek Discovery of Politics*. Translated by D. Mclintock. London.

Morris, I. and K.A. Raaflaub (eds.) 1998. *Democracy 2500?: Questions and Challenges*. Dubuque.

Neils, J. 1994. ‘The Panathenaia and Kleisthenic Ideology,’ in W.D.E. Coulson, O. Palagia, T.L. Shear, H.A. Shapiro and F.J. Frost (eds.), *The Archaeology of Athens and Attike under the Democracy*. Oxford. 151-160.

Ober, J. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. Princeton.

--- 1993. ‘The Athenian Revolution of 508/7 BCE,’ in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.), *Cultural Poetics in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge. 215-232.

--- 1996. *The Athenian Revolution: Essays on Ancient Greek Democracy and Political Theory*. Princeton.

--- 1998. ‘Revolution Matters: Democracy as Demotic Action (A Response to Kurt A. Raaflaub,’ in Morris and Raaflaub 1998: 67-85.

Osborne, R. 1985. Demos*: The Discovery of Classical Attika*. Cambridge.

--- 1987. Review of Hansen 1986, *JHS* 107: 233.

Ostwald, M. 1986. *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of the Law*. Berkeley, London and Los Angeles.

--- 1988. ‘The Reform of the Athenian State by Cleisthenes,’ in J. Boardman, N.G.L. Hammond, D.M. Lewis and M. Ostwald (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Second edition. Cambridge. Volume 4: 303-346.

Parkin, T.G. 1992. *Demography and Roman Society*. Baltimore and London.

Pelliccia, H. 2003. ‘Two Points about Rhapsodes,’ in M. Finkelberg and G.G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World*. Boston and Leiden. 97-116.

Phillips, D.J. 1981. ‘Participation in Athenian Democracy,’ *Ancient Society: Resources for Teachers.* The journal is now *AH*. 11: 5-48.

Phillips, D.J. and D.M. Pritchard (eds.) 2003. *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World*. Swansea.

Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. 1962. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*. Revised edition. Oxford.

--- 1968. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Second edition revised by J. Gould and D.M. Lewis. Oxford.

Pritchard, D.M. 1995. ‘How the Athenian Military was Organised in the Late Fifth Century,’ *Stele: A Student Journal of Antiquity* 1: 70-73.

--- 1999. ‘Fool’s Gold and Silver: Reflections on the Evidentiary Status of Finely Painted Attic Pottery,’ *Antichthon* 33: 1-27.

--- 2000a. *The Fractured Imaginary: Popular Thinking on Citizen Soldiers and Warfare in Fifth-Century Athens*. PhD dissertation. A revised version is forthcoming with Routledge. Macquarie University, Sydney.

--- 2000b. ‘Tribal Participation and Solidarity in Fifth-Century Athens: A Summary,’ *AH* 30: 104-118.

--- 2003a. ‘Athletics, Education and Participation in Classical Athens,’ in Phillips and Pritchard 2003: 293-349.

--- 2003b. ‘Athletics in Ancient Athens,’ *Insite* September-October: 5.

--- 2004. ‘War Minus the Shooting,’ *Campus Review* 12-19 August: 10-11.

Raaflaub, K.A. 1998a. ‘Power in the Hands of the People: Foundations of Athenian Democracy,’ in Morris and Raaflaub 1998: 31-66.

--- 1998b. ‘The Thetes and Democracy (A Response to Josiah Ober),’ in Morris and Raaflaub 1998: 87-103.

Rhodes, P.J. 1982. ‘Problems in Athenian *Eisphora* and Liturgies,’ *AJAH* 7: 1-19.

Robb, K. 1994. *Literacy and Paideia in Ancient Greece*. New York and Oxford.

Roberts, J.T. 1986. ‘Aristocratic Democracy: The Perseverance of Timocratic Principles in Athenian Government,’ *Athenaeum* 64: 355-369.

Rosivach, V.J. 1985. [1992] ‘Manning the Athenian Fleet,’ *AJAH* 10: 41-66.

--- 1991. ‘Some Athenian Presuppositions about ‘the Poor’,’ *G&R* 38: 189-198.

--- 2001. ‘Class Matters in *Dyskolos* of Menander,’ *CQ* 51: 127-134.

--- 2002. '*Zeugitai* and Hoplites,' *AHB* 16: 33-43.

Roussel, D. 1976. *Tribu et Cité: Études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époque archaique et classique*. Paris.

Scheidel, W. 2001. 'Roman Age Structure : Evidence and Models,' *JRS* 91: 1-26.

Siewert, P. 1982. *Die Trittyen Attikes und die Heeresreform des Kleisthenes*. Munich.

Sinclair, R.K. 1988. *Democracy and Participation in Athens*. Cambridge.

Singor, H.W. 2000. 'The Military Side of the Peisistratean Tyranny,' in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence*. Amsterdam. 107-126.

Sommerstein, A.H. 1996. 'How to Avoid Being a *Komodoumenos*,' *CQ* 46: 327-356.

Spence, I.G. 1993. *The Cavalry of Classical Greece: A Social and Military History with Particular Reference to Athens*. Oxford.

Tarrant, H. 2003. 'Competition and the Intellectual,' in Phillips and Pritchard 2003: 351-363.

Van Wees, H. 2000. 'The City at War,' in R. Osborne (ed.), *Classical Greece 500-323 BC*. Oxford. 81-110.

Vartsos, J.A. 1978. 'Class Division in Fifth-Century Athens,' *Platon* 30: 226-244.

Vidal-Naquet, P. 1968. 'La tradition de l'hoplite athénien,' in J.-P. Vernant (ed.), *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne*. Paris. 161-182.

Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the* Khoregia*: The Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge.

--- 2003. 'The Politics of Dance: Dithyrambic Contest and Social Order in Ancient Greece,' in Phillips and Pritchard 2003: 163-196.

Zimmermann, B. 1992. *Dithyrambos: Geschichte einer Gattung*. Gottingen.

--- 1996. 'Das Lied der Polis: Zur Geschichte des Dithyrambos,' in A.H. Sommerstein, S. Halliwell, J. Henderson and B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis: Papers from the Greek Drama Conference Nottingham, 18-20 July 1990*. Bari. 39-54.

Endnotes

[1] E.g. *Ath. Pol.* 21.2; Arist. *Pol.* 1275b34-40, 1319b19-27; Plut. *Per.* 3.2-3.

[2] Ostwald 1986: 15-28; 1988: 303-325. Anderson renders explicit his commitment to an elitist interpretation of the reforms (2003: 81; cf. 9): '…the new order was not the spontaneous creation of a popular revolutionary fervour, however much the support of nonelite citizens might have been crucial to its success. Rather it should be seem as a massive, ingenious, and artfully self-conscious exercise in social engineering – the product, in short, of a vision from above, not from below.'

[3] Quotation from Ober 1993: 216. This article can now be found at Ober 1996: 18-31. His thesis is the subject of a valuable exchange of articles between himself (1998) and Kurt Raaflaub (1998a, 1998b). While Raaflaub forces Ober to concede that there were decades of critical political developments after Kleisthenes, he does not successfully undermine the evidence for what Ober argues, nor the latter's interpretation of the events of 508/7 BCE as a paradigm shift in civic ideology and practice, which provided the basic framework for the evolution and development of the classical Athenian democracy. *Contra* Anderson 2003: 76-83.

[4] Meier 1990: 53-81.

[5] Lewis 1963.

[6] While Anderson certainly notes how the reforms 'mixed up' elite and non-elite Athenians (2003: 18, 36, 82-83), he emphasizes rather their critical role in breaking down the ongoing regionalism of sixth-century Attike (2003: 13-42, 124-125).

[7] E.g. Lewis 1963: 36-37; Meier 1990: 75-76. For the private military ventures of archaic Athenians, before Kleisthenes, and the creation of the first formal, city-controlled army as part of his reforms, see Anderson 2003: 147-157; Frost 1984; Pritchard 2000a: 131-134; Siewert 1982; Singor 2000; van Effenterre 1976.

[8] Cartledge (2001: 166), Hanson (2001: 166) and van Wees (2000: 85) estimate that between around 30 and 50 per cent of a classical citizen-body were hoplites. Ober, by contrast, holds that 'hoplites typically represented roughly 20 to 40 percent of a Greek polis' free adult males' (1996: 59), whereas Vidal-Naquet speculates that 'moins du tier' of Athenian citizens were hoplites in 490 BCE (1968: 170). In the face of such divergent estimates, a more reliable idea of what percentage of Athenians served as hoplites can be gained by combining the troop numbers Thucydides gives for 431 with the population figure and model life table Hansen has established for this period of Athenian history. (The detail

and reliability of Hansen's demographic calculations are discussed below.) Thucydides 2.13.6-7 states that, at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, there were 13,000 hoplites in the Athenian hoplite army, excluding 'the oldest and the youngest', who typically were not called up for active service. These two reserve groups were most probably aged between 50 and 59 years and 18 and 19 years respectively (Hansen 1988: 23 n.12 with primary sources). Independently of Thucydides, Hansen makes a case that there were around 60,000 adult citizens living in Attike in 431 (see below). According to the model life he selects (1988: 21 n.9), 20 to 49 year olds are 72.7% of all males aged 18 to 80+ years, meaning that there were 43,620 Athenians in this age band in 431. Thus the 13,000 active hoplites represented only 29.8% of this age group. The percentage of citizens who were hoplites would have been marginally higher before the creation of the cavalry corps of 1200 in the late 440s or early 430s (for the date, see Spence 1993: 9-17). Since the 1000 horsemen of this corps were members of the upper class (Bugh 1988: 18, 38, 55; Spence 1993: 191-198 – both with ancient references), they would otherwise have served as hoplites. While these horsemen – along with the Athenian hoplites – were organized into tribal units, no other corps of combatants in classical Athens fought or mustered according to tribes (Pritchard 1995; 2000b: 112-114 *pace* Golden 1990: 67; Jones 1987: 53-57).

[9] An Athenian had to be at least 30 years old to be a *bouleutēs* (*Ath. Pol.* 30.2, 31.1) and could serve on the Council only twice (62.3). Thus the theoretical minimum of new councilors needed each year was two hundred and fifty. Again using Hansen's chosen model life table and population figures, as 30 year olds were 2.7% of the adult population, in the fourth century, when there were 30,000 citizens, there were 810 new candidates for the Council each year. Thus it could operate if only 30.86% served. However, from the extant records of actual *bouleutai* in the fourth century, Hansen establishes that only 25% of councilors in fact served twice, and that the *actual* average age of a first-time *bouleutēs* was 40 years (Hansen 1986: 51-64; 1988b; cf. 1991: 248-249). This attested lower rate of repeat service required 400 new councilors to be found each year. Additionally, 40 year olds were only 2.1% of the adult population and so numbered 630 in any year. Therefore, the documented pattern of bouleutic service would have required 63.49% of 40-year-old citizens to serve on the Council. In the fourth century, then, the Council of Five Hundred 'could not have operated unless a reasonable number of *thetes*…had turned up for selection to the Council' (Hansen 1991: 249). In the Periklean age, when the citizen population was double, only half of this percentage of 40 year olds was required. Nonetheless, at this time, we cannot say that it was the topmost 30 percent of citizens in the social hierarchy who served, since the

participation of sub-hoplite citizens cannot be ruled out; for bouleutic service, probably from the 450s or 440s, attracted a *misthos* (*Ath. Pol.* 29.5; cf. 27.3; Plato *Gorgias* 515e; see Phillips 1981: 30-31), just as it did in the fourth century (*Ath.Pol.* 62.2). And thetic citizens were no less committed to public service in the fifth than they were in the fourth century.

[10] An exception here is Anderson who makes little of the dithyrambic choruses and does not see the religious elements of the Great Dionysia nor the divine attributes of Dionysos as underwriting the Kleisthenic reforms (2003: 178-184).

[11] Zimmermann 1996: 42-43; cf. 1992. That he assumes elite and non-elite participation is suggested by his further argument that the *khorēgia* – not the *khoroi* – gave aristocrats an exalted place in 'der demokratischen Phyle' (43).

[12] Fisher 1998: 93; cf. 90. Fisher also makes a case for a similar level of participation in the athletic competitions and tribally organized torch races of classical Athens. I provide a detailed critique of the arguments and evidence of his case in Pritchard 2003a, esp. 318-331.

[13] Wilson 2000: 75; cf. 339 n.111.

[14] Wilson 2000: 76; cf. 2003: 168. Golden writes (1990: 67): 'Choral competition therefore brought boys face to face with their peers from elsewhere in the *polis* at the same time that it introduced them to the community as a whole. In this way, a boy's circle of acquaintances could extend beyond his family and neighbors. Moreover, he was not the only one to benefit. Since the tribe was the basic organizational unit of the Athenian armed forces, this boyhood identification with the tribe and camaraderie with its members could only improve Athens' military morale and effectiveness when boys singers became adult soldiers.'

[15] Quotation from Wilson 2003: 168. This analogy was made in passing by Roussel in the mid-1970s: 'Dans tous les domaines, à la Boulè, parmi leur prytanes, à l'armée, *dans les chœurs*, aux quels participaient chaque année des centaines de citoyens, et en bien d'autres occasions, les phylai clisthéniennes furent pour les Athéniens des écoles de civisme et de sociabilité' (1976: 284, my italics).

[16] Wilson 2003: 182. The date of 508/7 BCE for their introduction comes from the so-called Parian Marble (see Csapo and Slater 1995: no. 45; Zimmermann 1996: 42 n.11).

[17] Jasper Griffin makes the same assumption (1998: 44): 'Everybody must either have performed in a dithyrambic chorus or have known somebody who did.' Hayden Pelliccia comes to a similar position (2003: 102).

[18] For a summary of my research, see Pritchard 2000b.

[19] The model of Athenian society employed here will be familiar to social historians of classical Athens and basically follows Davies 1981: 21-28; Markle 1985: 266-271; Rosivach 1991; 2001; and especially Vartsos 1978 – all with primary references.

[20] The phrase in quotation marks is adapted from Vartsos 1978: 232. For the lack of ancient evidence for a link between the Solonian *telē* and military roles, which is asserted *ad nauseum* in classical scholarship, and the implausibility of such a link in view of the low level of military activity in archaic Athens, see now Rosivach 2002.

[21] For the literary evidence of these activities as exclusive preserves of the wealthy and of the popularly perceived lifestyle and behaviour of the poor, see the Pritchard 2000a: 51-63.

[22] For the paying of the *eisphora* as the responsibility of elite citizens, see, for example, Ar. *Eq.* 923-926; Is. 5.45; Isoc. 19.36; Lysias 7.31, 22.13, 25.12-13, 27.9-10. For their provision of the city's leaders, see Pritchard 2000a: 64-70 with ancient references.

[23] This estimate is based on the percentage of Athenians who undertook liturgies and especially paid the *eisphora*. See Hansen 1991: 109-115; Pritchard 2000a: 56-58; and Rhodes 1982 *pace* Davies 1981: 24-27. Hansen's figure for fourth-century *eisphora* payers produces an elite of 4 percent of the citizen-body (1991: 90-94, 115).

[24] See n.21 above.

[25] For the date of the introduction of this tribal team event, see n.16 above and Davies 1967: 33; Pickard-Cambridge 1962: 15; 1968: 72. For useful discussions of the details of the tribally arranged dithyrambic contests, see Golden 1990: 65-67; Pickard-Cambridge 1962: 1-59; 1968: 75-79; and especially Wilson 2000: 50-98. I am not convinced that there were also tribally organized dithyrambic contests at the festivals of the Hephaistia and Promethia. In spite of Wilson's recent plea for this to be kept as a possibility (2000: 35-36), the arguments against, well presented by Davies (1967: 35-36 with references), remain strong; *IG* II^2 1138.9-12 and Pseudo-Xenophon 3.4 can safely be taken to refer to tribal torch races and each of the other ancient sources mentioning contests at these festivals mention only torch races, gymnasiarchs and/or their teams.

[26] For this date, see Davies 1967: 34. For a discussion of how a poetic genre so closely linked with Dionysos could be added to a festival worshipping Apollo, see Wilson 2003: 170.

[27] Many references bear out the responsibility of each tribe to select these chorus sponsors and their ability to conscript them if necessary: *Ath. Pol.* 56.3; Antiphon 6.11; Dem. 21.13, 39.7; *IG* II^2 1140.12-15, 1147.9-11, 1157.2-3, 1158.2-3. This attested conscription undercuts the suggestion of Davies that recruitment for tribal liturgies, like other agonistic liturgies, was purely voluntary (1981: 24-27).

[28] With MacDowell 1990: 235-236. For an explanation of why they were also known as 'circular choruses', see Csapo and Slater 1995: no. 28.

[29] The regular season for overseas expeditions is isolated at Rosivach 1985: 41-44.

[30] For the calendar of major classical Athenian festivals, see Bruit Zaidman and Schmitt Pantel 1992: 103-104.

[31] The prioritising of the city centre for tribal assemblies, proclamations, religious rituals and the setting up honorific decrees has been put beyond doubt by Jones (1995: 505-518). Jones 1995 can now be found at Jones 1999: 151-173.

[32] The suggestion here that the Athenian *dēmos* prefers singing, running, dancing and sailing instead of athletics is itself derogatory, since these were the preferences of the Phaiakians of the *Odyssey* (e.g. 8.246-249). In the classical period they were considered to be one of the quintessential examples of a people devoted to soft living and unacquainted with manly pursuits, especially warfare (see Dickie 1984).

[33] Ceccarelli also questions the objectivity of this treatise on the grounds that it is 'un texte fortement connoté politiquement' and concludes that 'il faudra essayer de restituer la réalité historique à l'aide d'autres sources' (1993: 446). Similarly Harding judges Pseudo-Xenophon a 'tormented outsider' whose 'distorted viewpoint' must be rejected (1981: 41 ; cf. Sinclair 1988: 120). The reliability of Pseudo-Xenophon decreases further if we accept the not implausible argument of Hornblower that his treatise is '…a *fourth-century* work about the *fifth-century* Athenian democracy and empire, which the author pretends are still in existence; that it is in fact a clever (if clumsily written), ludic work of imaginative fiction which perhaps belongs to the genre of literature associated with the *symposion* or ritualized drinking session…' (2000: 361).

[34] I am following the interpretation of this inscription by Kyle (1987: 145-147).

[35] See Sommerstein 1996, especially 331.

[36] For the torch races of classical Athens as predominantly elite activities before the ephebic reforms of 335 BCE, see Pritchard 2003a: 328-330; cf. 2000b: 110-111.

[37] *Pace* Kowalzig 2004: 39-41.

[38] At present, scholarly opinion weighs against the possibility of Athenian girls being sent to schools like their brothers. Nonetheless female education in classical Athens remains something of a quandary requiring further research and debate. Admittedly there are a few literary references to elite women with some literacy (e.g. Xen. *Oec.* 9.10) and numerous depictions of women, on red-figure pots, holding a book roll, playing a musical instrument or dancing (e.g. Beck 1975: nos. 349-405). On the other hand, no extant literary source mentions

Athenian girls going to school (Cole 1981: 226; Harris 1989: 97), and most of the abovementioned women are explicitly named or styled on the pots as Sappho or the Muses (Beck 1978: 5; Lewis 2002: 157-9). Those not identified as such may be *hetairai* or courtesans, whose educated conversation was greatly savoured by Athenian gentlemen (Golden 1990: 74; Harris 1989: 107). The fullest treatment of female literacy is Cole 1981. For a spirited and still valuable argument for the existence of schools for ancient Greek girls, see Beck 1978.

[39] These three disciplines are so described in Aristophanes' *Clouds* where they are contrasted with the 'New Education' of the sophists. In spite of the complaints of the personified 'Old Education' in this comedy (921-1023), a close reading of this character's *agon* speech suggests that boys are still going to the lessons of the *paidotribēs* and *kitharistēs* and spending time at the city's athletics fields. This continuity is confirmed too by the athletic setting of several Platonic dialogues and the perceived need of Athens-based sophists and philosophers to speak highly of athletics and to cloak their own educational endeavours in sporting metaphors (see Pritchard 2003a: 302; Tarrant 2003).

[40] Independent cases for the concurrent scheduling of classes are made at Beck 1964: 81-83; Golden 1990: 62-63; and Marrou 1956: 148 – all with primary references. *Didaskaleion* was a generic word for premises used for education (e.g. Aeschin. 1.9; Dem. 18.258; Paus. 6.9.6; Theophr. *Char.* 30.14; Thuc. 7.29.5; Xen. *Cyr.* 1.2.15).

[41] E.g. Ar. *Eq.* 1235; *Nub.* 916, 938; Isoc. 15.183; Dem. 18.257, 265; cf. Ath. 584c. See *LSJ* s.v. *phoitaō*.

[42] E.g. Aeschin. 1.9-11; Ar. *Ran.* 727-730; Pl. *Leg.* 654a-b, 672c. Thus I do not agree with Wilson that dithyrambic choristers lived 'for the duration of their training' in their *didaskaleion* (2000: 72), but accept his alternate suggestion that (2000: 74): '…*khoreutai* might attend a *khoregeion* on a daily basis, rather than being permanently resident in their place of training.'

[43] Translated by Lamb. Similar observations can be found in other classical Athenian sources: Ar. *Nub.* 101, 797-798; Pl. *Ap.* 23c; Ps.-Xen. 1.15; Xen. *Cyn.* 2.1.

[44] E.g. Dem. 18.256-267; Isoc. 7.43-45; Lysias 20.11-12; Xen. *Cyr.* 1.2.15; 8.3.37-30.

[45] Pritchard 2003a. The most important literary sources for this restricted education of lower class boys are Ar. *Ran.* 727-733; *Vesp.* 1122-264; Eur. *El.* 528; Isoc. 7.45; and Aeschin. 2.147, 149.

[46] E.g. Dem. 21.63, 156; Lys. 21.1-5; Xen. *Eq. mag.* 1.26; cf. Ar. *Plut.* 1161-1162. This passage of Lysias actually provides figures and is superbly explored at Wilson 2000: 89-93.

[47] For tribal honours and honorands, see Jones 1995: 531-537.

[48] See Wilson 2000: 109-197.

[49] For liturgies and the gratitude of jurors, see Dover 1974: 176-177; Ober 1989: 231-233; and Roberts 1986 – all with primary references.

[50] Zimmermann argues that it was the desire to win that encouraged poets of the classical period to innovate with the genre of the dithyramb (1996: 53-54).

[51] See Osborne 1985, 47-50, 69 with ancient testimonia.

[52] Osborne gives the impression that every upper class family of classical Athens had a city residence when he writes of the literary evidence of their land holdings (1985, 50): 'In all the multiple holdings where locations are known at least one *oikia* is found in or adjacent to the *astu* or in the Peiraieus.' Even if some rich Athenians did not have city houses, they would still have had the spare cash and/or social connections to allow their sons and themselves to find accommodation in the city, while training for the dithyramb was taking place.

[53] Quotation from Beck 1962: 128. This connection is also made by Robb (1994: 189-190). Plato writes very suggestively at *Theages* 123e that 'that [skill] whereby we know how to govern singers in a chorus' is *mousikē*. On the subject matter of Athenian dithyrambs, see Wilson 2000: 66-67. For the marked innovations of the dithyrambic poets of the second half of the fifth century, see Gentili 1988: 26-31; Pelliccia 2003: 101; Zimmermann 1992; 1996: 51-54.

[54] His specific work on Athenian demography includes Hansen 1981, 1985 and 1988. Hansen argues (1985: 11-12) for the model life table at Coale and Demeny 1966: 128 with an annual growth rate of 0.5 % (R = 5.00). For positive assessments of Hansen's demographic work, see Golden 1987; 2000; Osborne 1987. For a detailed demonstration of the utility of the Coale–Demeny life tables in understanding ancient Roman demography, see Parkin 1992: 67-90. *Contra* Scheidel 2001.

[55] Quotation from Wilson 2000: 75.

[56] The ancient sources are collected and considered at Golden 1990: 12-22, 68-69; 1998: 104-107. Wilson similarly suggests that *paides* were aged between c. 11 and 17 years (2000: 75), and Crowther finds evidence for those in competitions for *paides* at the Olympic Games being aged between 12 and 17 years (1988).

[57] Hansen 1986; 1991: 90-94.

[58] My calculations are confirmed by Hansen 1991: 93.

[59] Hansen 1991: 55. He spells out his arguments for this figure of 60,000 at Hansen 1988: 14-28, which also details the shortcomings of Gomme's calculation of around 47,000 adult Athenians in 431 BCE.

[60] E.g. Isoc. 15.181-185; Ar. *Eq.* 1238-239; Antiphon 3.1.1; 3.2.3, 7; 3.3.6; 3.4.4; etc. For a detailed discussion of the lessons of the athletics teacher and their relationship with competitive athletics, see Pritchard 2003a: 302-306; cf. 2003b; 2004.

[61] Thus I disagree with the suggestion of Pelliccia – made in his passing remarks about dithyrambic participation (2003: 102) – that 'there was no guarantee' that the choruses of the Thargelia 'were taken from the number of those performing in the City Dionysia.'

[62] For the regular expectation of the Athenian populace that leaders had to be wealthy and well educated and its manipulation by Aristophanes in this passage, see Pritchard 2000a: 67-70; 2003a: 319

[63] See nn.8 and 9 above. In my general consideration of participation in the tribal and tribally organized activities of fifth-century Athens I conclude (2000b: 115): 'Upper class Athenians participated in a wide and the widest range of tribally arranged activities, and had, as a result, rock solid, substantive connections with their respective tribe and fellow tribesmen. Nevertheless, non-elite hoplites did fraternize with *symphyletai* in the hoplite army, Council of Five Hundred and probably even in tribal assemblies, and so possessed a bond of solidarity with their tribe and its members, while less profound than their elitist peers, of a meaningful and long-term nature. The tribes of fifth-century Athens figured hardly at all in the lives of thetic citizens. This majority part of the citizen body took no part in tribal or tribally organized activities. Deprived of opportunities for interacting with fellow tribesmen, thetic citizens possessed no more than an empty, perfunctory association with their tribes.'

[64] For the quotation, see n.15 above.

[65] For choruses as a traditional form of education in archaic Greece, see Ingalls 2000; Kowalzig 2004. Thus participation in a dithyrambic chorus – and not just the opportunity to be *khorēgoi*, as Zimmermann argues – gave elite Athenians 'eine ehrenvolle Stellung in der demokratischen Phyle' (1996: 43).

[66] This is well illustrated by the discussion of the pre-play ceremonies at the classical Great Dionysia by Simon Goldhill (1990: 100-115).

[67] See Anderson 2003: 127-134.

[68] See n.7 above.

[69] See especially Meier 1990: 53-81.